1 PEFOPE THE POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS EOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 3 ALPHA INSULATION, INC. 4 Appellant, PCHE NO. 88-79 5 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, v. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 6 PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION AND ORDER CONTROL AGENCY, 7 Respondent. 8 9 THIS MATTER, the appeal of a notice and order of civil penalty 10 (No. 6820), assessing \$250 for alleged violations of asbestos removal 11 procedures came on for hearing on September 9, 1988, in Seattle, 12 Washington. Wick Dufford presided for the Board. Judith A. Bendor 13 has reviewed the record. 14 Benson D. Wong, Attorney at Law, represented appellant. Keith D. 15 McGoffin, Attorney at Law, represented respondent. The proceedings 16 were reported by Gene Barker and Associates. 17

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were admitted and examined. From the testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Eoard makes the following

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

FINDINGS OF FACT

I

Alpha Insulation, Incorporated, is a contractor which engages in asbestos removal. On February 18, 1988, the company was carrying out an asbestos removal project in a building being prepared for

demolition in the 1300 block on Third Avenue, between University and Union Streets in downtown Seattle, Washington.

ΙI

Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency (FSAPCA) is a municipal corporation with authority to conduct a program of air pollution prevention and control in an area which includes the subject downtown Seattle site. We take notice of PSAPCA's Regulation I, including Article 10 which deals with the removal and encapsulation of asbestos.

III

On February 18, 1988, PSPACA's inspector observed one of Alpha's workers emerge from 1307 Third Avenue with a clear plastic bag, tied at the top, containing debris. The markings on the bag included, "Danger Contains Asbestos Fibers." The worker carried the bag through an opening near 1321 Third Avenue and went inside. He then reappeared empty-handed.

IV

Outside the building a wooden-covered walkway had been erected while the job was in progress. This structure separated work areas from the general flow of pedestrian traffic. The worker had to crawl over angled two-by-fours bracing this structure to get to the opening where he entered the building with the bag of debris.

The bag hung up briefly as the worker moved past the two-by-fours. The PSAPCA inspector believed the bag had been ripped by this event.

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER PCHB No. 88-79 27 |

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

PCHE No. 88-79

After the worker re-emerged, the inspector entered the building through the same opening and found there on the floor, unattended, two clear plastic bags with identical markings warning of asbestos fibers. Both bags were closed at the top. Each was of only a single thickness. The bags contained asbestos debris.

VI

The inspector had no difficuly obtaining access to the space where he found the bags. The area was not behind a locked door. Anyone could have wandered in. Access was via an open aperture from which a loose plastic flap was hung. No asbestos warning signs were observed in the immediate vicinity. Workers not involved in asbestos removal and pedestrians were seen nearby.

VII

After the inspector observed the bags, he brought them to the attention of Alpha's foreman and superintendent. Double bags were brought in and the single bags were placed inside them. The superintendent called a meeting of his crew and delivered a lecture on the necessity of complying with asbestos removal regulations.

VIII

The area inside the building where the inspector observed the unattended bags was used by Alpha as a kind of holding area, where bags of asbestos debris were placed temporarily before being collected and put into a locked space behind for storage prior to disposal.

ı		

IX

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

PCHB No. 88-79

(4)

On March 1, 1988, PSAPCA's inspector mailed two Notices of Violation to Alpha Insulation relating to the observations made on February 18, 1988. The first, No. 25071, asserted a violation of PSAPCA Regulation I, Section 10.04(b)(2)(iii)(C). The second, No. 25072, asserted a violation of PSAPCA Regulation I, Section 10.05(b)(1)(111). On May 6, 1988, the agency sent Alpha a Notice and Order of Civil Penalty (No. 6820), assessing a fine of \$250 for the two violations alleged in the Notices of Violation. . ` On June 2, 1988, Alpha Insulation filed an appeal to this Board,

the matter becoming our PCHB No. 88-79.

X

Regulation I, Section 10.04(b)(2)(111)(C) is as follows:

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to cause or allow the removal or encapsulation of asbestos material or to work on an asbestos project unless: ...(2) The following procedures are employed: ...(iii) Asbestos materials that have been removed or stripped shall be: ...(C) Contained in a controlled area at all times until transported to a waste disposal site.

The definition of a "controlled area," in pertinent part, reads:

An area to which only certified asbestos workers or other authorized persons have access.

XΙ

Alpha asserts that the entire Third Avenue side of the building was a controlled area, and that asbestos caution tape had been put in place so as to indicate this.

1 However, we are pursuaded and we find that the area was not so 2 clearly marked and not so restricted as to entry as to effectively 3 limit access only to certified asbestos workers or other authorized 4 persons. 5 XII 6 Regulation I, Section 10.05(b)(1)(iii) is as follows: 7 (b) One of the following disposal methods shall be used during the collection, processing, packaging, 8 transporting or deposition of any asbestos-containing waste material; 9 (1) Treat all asbestos-containing waste material with water as follows: ...(iii) After wetting, 10 seal all asbestos-containing waste material in leak-tight containers while wet. 11 XIII 12 13 PSAPCA's allegation is that the requirement for sealing asbestos waste in leak-tight containers was violated because one of the bags 14 found by the inspector had been ripped. 15 However, no one who handled the bag, including the worker who 16 carried it, observed a rip. The photographic evidence admitted does 17 not show a rip. On review of all the testimony, we were not 18 convinced that the bag was, in fact, ripped. 19 20 XIV 21Alpha Insulation, Inc. has no prior record of violations of 22 PSAPCA's asbestos removal regulations. 23 24 25 26 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

(5)

27

PCHB No. 88-79

۰	۰

27 | PCHE No. 88-79

ΧV

Any Conclusion of Law which is deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings of Fact the Board enters the following CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Board has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter. Chapters 43.21B and 70.94 RCW.

ΙI

Based on our Findings, we conclude that no violation of Regulation I, Section 10.05(b)(l)(iii) was proven. The bags which were found were not shown to be other than leak-tight.

III

Based on our Findings, we conclude that the unattended presence of two bags of asbestos waste in the space where they were found by PSAPCA's inspector was a violation of Regulation I, Section 10.04(b)(2)(iii)(C). The area was not a controlled area as defined by the regulation.

ΙV

The penalty assessed in the instant case, \$250, is less than the statutory maximum of \$1000 per violation per day. RCW 70.04.431(1).

However, we are mindful that the civil penalties in question are principally intended not for retribution but for the alteration of behavior. For the single violation found, in light of the record

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

1	before us, some degree of mitigation is appropriate.
2	v
3	Any Finding of Fact which is deemed a Conclusion of Law is hereby
4	adopted as such.
5	From these conclusions, the Board enters this
6	ORDER
7	The violation of Section 10.05(b)(l)(iii) is REVERSED. The
8	violation of Section 10.04(b)(2)(iii)(C) is AFFIRMED. The civil
9	penalty is AFFIRMED, but is SUSPENDED provided that appellant does
10	not violate the State Clean Air Act, Chapter 70.94 RCW or PSAPCA
11	Regulations for two years from the date of this Order.
12	~~t.
13	DONE this 27th day of, 1989.
14	POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
15	(· · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
16	WICK DUFFORD, Presiding
17	OUD NR. 1
18	JUDITH A. BENDOR, Member
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER
27	PCHB No. 88-79 (7)